

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-6 in the application. In the present response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1-3 and have added Claims 7-9. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs 21-27 and 31 of the original disclosure. Accordingly, Claims 1-9 are currently pending in the application.

I. Formal Matters and Objections

The Examiner has objected that the list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper, namely, an Information Disclosure Statement. In response, the Applicants have submitted an Information Disclosure Statement, along with references, herewith to correct this informality and appreciate the Examiner's diligence in finding and bringing this error to their attention.

The Examiner has also objected to the abstract, disclosure and Claims 1-3 as containing informalities. In response, the Applicants have amended the abstract, disclosure and Claims 1-3 to correct these informalities and appreciate the Examiner's diligence in finding and bringing these errors to their attention.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as not pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his

invention. In response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 4 and 5 to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §112 rejection with respect to these Claims and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Two-Stage Mel-Warped Wiener Filter for Robust Speech Recognition” to Agarwal, *et al.* (hereinafter “Agarwal”) in view of “Low-Bitrate Distributed Speech Recognition for Packet-Based and Wireless Communication” to Bernard, *et al.* (hereinafter “Bernard”). The Applicants respectfully disagree in view of amended independent Claims 1 and 3.

Agarwal is directed to the problem of degradation of speech recognition systems in the presence of additive noise, such as, automobile noise. (*See* Abstract.) The Applicants fail to find, however, where Agarwal discloses a method for performing time and frequency SNR dependent weighting in speech recognition including: applying time and frequency weighting to a spectral distance employing a time-varying diagonal matrix that represents a weighting coefficient. As such, Agarwal fails to disclose each and every element of amended independent Claims 1 and 3.

Bernard fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Agarwal since Bernard is directed to applying a time-varying weight instead of applying time and frequency weighting. (*See* section V, page 575-576.) Accordingly, the cited combination of Agarwal individually or in combination with Bernard does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claims 1

and 3. The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1 and 3 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Rejection of Claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal in view of Bernard and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,801 to Pastor, *et al.* (hereinafter "Pastor"). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, the cited combination of Agarwal and Bernard does not teach or suggest each element of amended independent Claims 1 and 3. The Applicants fail to find where Pastor cures these deficiencies of Agarwal and Bernard. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to indicate otherwise if the Examiner disagrees.

Thus, in view of amended independent Claims 1 and 3, the cited combination of Agarwal, Bernard and Pastor does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 1 and 3 and Claims 2 and 6 which depend thereon. The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 2 and 6 and allow issuance thereof.


IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-9.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: December 26, 2007

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800